arXiv:1210.5530v1 [quant-ph] 19 Oct 2012

Detecting three or more partite entanglement of pure states with bipartite correlations

Marcin Markiewicz,[1] Wiesław Laskowski,[1] Tomasz Paterek,[2,3] and Marek Żukowski[1]
[1] *Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland*
[2] *Division of Physics and Applied Physics, School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*
[3] *Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore*

We show that monogamy of bipartite correlations leads to experimentally friendly conditions for detection of multipartite entanglement of pure states. The conditions make no additional assumptions about tested states and we illustrate their application with Dicke states. Finally, we compare this criterion with quantum marginal problem and criteria based on spin operators.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn

I. INTRODUCTION

For bipartite systems the phenomenon of quantum entanglement manifests itself in correlations. Extrapolating to multipartite case one might expect that genuinely n-partite entanglement gives rise to non-vanishing correlations between all n subsystems. This intuition has been shown to be incorrect, at least when correlations are quantified as average values of a product of local measurement results [1, 2]. Therefore, in order to detect genuine multipartite entanglement of certain states one has to rely on correlations between smaller number of subsystems.

Here we discuss global features of multiparty pure states, which can be deduced from their bipartite correlations only (correlations between pairs of subsystems). We shall use the property of monogamy of correlations [3]. Another approach has recently been put forward by Würflinger *et al.* [4] and shows that entanglement of noisy W state of several qubits can be confirmed from the knowledge of a bipartite separable reduced one and that genuine tripartite entanglement of tripartite noisy W state can be detected by measuring bipartite classical correlations.

Monogamy of quantum correlations has already been used to design a method of efficient entanglement detection [5], but here we shall use it to derive a criterion for *genuine* multipartite entanglement. Other applications of correlation monogamy include quantum marginal problem, which aims at giving conditions for existence of a global quantum state given its marginals [6], security of quantum key distribution [7], derivation of Bell monogamy relations [3] and an argument that correlations between macroscopic measurements ought to be classical [8]. Moreover it is a theoretical basis for efficient methods of solving strongly correlated multipartite quantum lattice systems [9].

II. CORRELATION TENSORS AND BASIC DEFINITIONS

We shall be interested here in states of several qubits (two-level quantum systems). Any n-qubit density matrix can be expressed in a tensor form:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_n=0,1,2,3} T_{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_n} \sigma_{\mu_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{\mu_n}, \qquad (1)$$

where $\sigma_{\mu_k} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\}$ are the Pauli matrices of the nth observer. In contrast to the standard representation, the above one directly encodes the structure of local subsystems and has a straightforward operational interpretation. The coefficients $T_{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_n} \in [-1, 1]$ are given by correlation function values for local measurements of Pauli operators: $T_{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_n} = \mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho\, \sigma_{\mu_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{\mu_n})$. The whole object $\hat{T} \equiv T_{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_n}$, where the indices take on values $\mu_k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, can be called an extended correlation tensor. Its components with k zeros transform like $(n-k)$-order tensors under local unitary transformations on the qubits.

A pure n-partite state $|\psi\rangle$ is called k-product, if it can be represented as a tensor product of k pure i_m-partite states:

$$|\psi_{k-\mathrm{prod}}\rangle = |\psi_{i_1}\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |\psi_{i_k}\rangle, \qquad (2)$$

where of course, $\sum_{m=1}^{k} i_m = n$. There can be different types of k-product states corresponding to different ways of partitioning n into a sum of k integers. We will refer to a definite type of k-product state as $(i_1 + \ldots + i_k)$-partition product state. If a state is not k-product, then it must involve entanglement between at least $n - k + 2$ parties. Note that if a state is not k-product it also cannot be k'-product with $k' \geq k$.

III. PROPERTIES OF BIPARTITE CORRELATIONS OF n-PARTITE STATE

The quantity which plays a crucial role in our investigation is the sum of squares of all possible bipartite correlations for a given state ρ. Due to monogamy relations, they have the following properties.

Proposition 1 *For any n-qubit state (pure or mixed) the following tight bounds hold:*

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{i,j=1,2} \sum_{\sigma} T^2_{\pi(i,j,0,\dots,0)} \leq \binom{n}{2}, \ \ \textit{for } n \geq 3, \qquad (3)$$
$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_{i,j=1,2} T^2_{ij} \leq 2, \ \ \textit{for } n = 2,$$

where π denotes permutations of local subsystems, and indices i, j enumerate any two orthogonal (on the Bloch sphere) local measurement directions.

Proof. Let us first consider the case $n \geq 3$. For the sake of convenience we denote $\sum_{i,j=1,2} T^2_{0,\dots,i,0,\dots,j,0,\dots,0}$ by x_{kl}, where k, l refer to the position of i and j respectively. The expression (3) can be rephrased as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M} &= (x_{12} + x_{13} + \dots + x_{1n}) + (x_{23} + x_{24} + \dots + x_{2n}) \\ &+ \ldots + (x_{n-2,n-1} + x_{n-2,n}) + (x_{n-1,n}). \qquad (4)\end{aligned}$$

Now, the following monogamy relations for Bell-type bipartite correlations hold [3]:

$$x_{ij} + x_{jk} \leq 2, \quad \text{for all } i \neq j \neq k, \qquad (5)$$
$$x_{ij} + x_{jk} + x_{ik} \leq 3, \quad \text{for all } i \neq j \neq k. \qquad (6)$$

The sum (4) is distributed into $n-1$ blocks, where in each block one subsystem is common for all correlations within it. We group its terms in pairs and triples in such a way that using relations (5) and (6) gives the bound (3). We proceed as follows. If $\binom{n}{2}$ is even we match adjacent terms in all blocks with even number of elements, while in case of blocks with odd number of elements we do the same, except for the last element of each block, which we match with the last element of adjacent odd terms block. If $\binom{n}{2}$ is odd we treat the last two blocks as a triple of terms, and use mentioned procedure for the rest of terms in the sum. Within this algorithm we obtain ordering of terms in such a way that all pairs have one element in common. In the case of even $\binom{n}{2}$ we use $\binom{n}{2}/2$ inequalities (5), which exactly gives the bound (3), and in the case of odd $\binom{n}{2}$ we use $\left(\binom{n}{2} - 3\right)/2$ times the inequality (5) and once the inequality (6), which gives the same bound.

For $n = 2$ the proposition is proven in Ref. [3].

The bound (3) is tight as it is achieved for example by a product state $|+\rangle \ldots |+\rangle$, where $|+\rangle$ is the eigenstate of local σ_x operator with $+1$ eigenvalue. Clearly, for this state all $\binom{n}{2}$ correlation tensor elements with two x indices are equal to 1. $\square$

Since the bound of $\mathcal{M}$ is attained by a product state, this quantity is inappropriate as entanglement identifier. To overcome this problem we define a new quantity, $\mathcal{N}$. Before we proceed with the definition, let us notice the following. For each local subsystem (each qubit) one can find a local Bloch vector which defines its (reduced density matrix). The direction of this local Bloch vector can be used to define the versor $\hat{z}$ of the local Cartesian basis. Thus, the local system will be totally noisy if one measures the Pauli operator linked to the other two orthogonal directions. If a subsystem has vanishing Bloch vector, any axis can serve as the $\hat{z}$ direction (which below will be always specified for the k-th qubit as $i_k = 3$). The new quantity $\mathcal{N}$ will use two particle correlations in directions orthognal to the local Bloch vector of the given pair of qubits.

Definition 1 *For any pure state $|\psi\rangle$ endowed with the property that, for each qubit, $k = 1, 2, ..., n$*

$$T_{0,\dots,0,i_k,0,\dots,0} = 0 \qquad (7)$$

for at least two non-zero values of the index i_k (denoted below as $1, 2$) one defines a quantity $\mathcal{N}$ as:

$$\mathcal{N} = \sum_{i,j=1,2} \sum_{\sigma} T^2_{\pi(i,j,0,\dots,0)}, \qquad (8)$$

where the indices i, j are such that the property (7) holds for them.

The quantity $\mathcal{N}$ has the following property, which makes it useful as entanglement identifier.

Proposition 2 *For given type of k-product state $|\psi_{k-\text{prod}}\rangle = |\psi^{i_1}\rangle|\psi^{i_2}\rangle...|\psi^{i_k}\rangle$, where $i_1 + ... + i_k = n$, and i_m gives the number of qubits in the m-th subsystem, the following property holds:*

$$\max_{|\psi_{k-\text{prod}}\rangle} \mathcal{N}(|\psi^{i_1}\rangle|\psi^{i_2}\rangle...|\psi^{i_k}\rangle) = \sum_{m=1}^{k} \max_{|\psi^{i_m}\rangle} \mathcal{N}(|\psi^{i_m}\rangle) \quad (9)$$

where $|\psi^{i_m}\rangle$ denotes a pure state on the m-th subsystem.

Proof. Note that in the sum $\mathcal{N}(|\psi^{i_1}\rangle|\psi^{i_2}\rangle...|\psi^{i_k}\rangle)$ correlation tensor elements with index i for one subsystem and index j for the other, compare with (8), vanish due to the assumption about the local $\hat{z}$ direction. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{|\psi_{k-\text{prod}}\rangle} \mathcal{N}(|\psi^{i_1}\rangle|\psi^{i_2}\rangle...|\psi^{i_k}\rangle) &= \max_{|\psi_{k-\text{prod}}\rangle} \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mathcal{N}(|\psi^{i_m}\rangle) \\ = \sum_{m=1}^{k} \max_{|\psi^{i_m}\rangle} \mathcal{N}(|\psi^{i_m}\rangle), \qquad (10)\end{aligned}$$

where the last equation follows from the fact that now we optimize k independent functions.$\square$

IV. ENTANGLEMENT CONDITIONS

The following Proposition is a basis of our method of identifying entanglement:

Proposition 3 *For any pure n-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$, where $n \geq 3$, and any class $\mathcal{S}$ of k-product states of the type $i_1 + ... + i_k = n$ the following holds:*

$$|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{S} \Longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle) \leq \sum_{m=1}^{k} \binom{i_m}{2} + d, \tag{11}$$

where d is number of terms with $i_m = 2$.

Proof. For any state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle) &\leq \max_{|\psi_{\mathcal{S}}\rangle} \mathcal{N}(|\psi_{\mathcal{S}}\rangle) = \sum_{m=1}^{k} \max_{|\psi^{i_m}\rangle} \left(\mathcal{N}(|\psi^{i_m}\rangle) \right) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{k} \binom{i_m}{2} + d. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The first equality follows from Proposition 2 and the second from Proposition 1.□

This criterion allows us to disqualify certain forms of k-product states. Namely, if $\mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle) > \sum_{m=1}^{k} \binom{i_m}{2} + d$ then the state cannot be a k-product state with respect to the division characterized by numbers $i_1, \ldots, i_k$. The technical Lemma 1 of the Appendix shows the maximum of the bound (11) over all possible splits of n parties into k subsystems, i.e. all k-element decomposition of number n into natural numbers. Results of this lemma and Proposition 3 imply the following criterion for multipartite entanglement.

Proposition 4 *For any pure n-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$, where $n \geq 3$, the following implication holds:*

$$\mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle) > s_k \Longrightarrow |\psi\rangle \text{ is not } k\text{-product},$$

where auxiliary sequence $\{s_k\}_{k=2}^{n-1}$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} s_k &= \binom{n-k+1}{2}, \text{ for } k = 2, ..., n-3 \\ s_{n-2} &= 4 \\ s_{n-1} &= 2 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Proof follows straightforwardly from Proposition 3 and Lemma 1 in the Appendix. □

As a corollary we have the following simple condition for genuinely multipartite entanglement, which here means that a state cannot be written as a bi-product state.

Proposition 5 *For any n-qubit pure state $|\psi\rangle$, where $n \geq 5$, if*

$$\mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle) > \binom{n-1}{2}$$

then $|\psi\rangle$ is genuinely n-partite entangled. For $n = 3$ and $n = 4$ we have respectively:

$$\mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle) > 2 \Longrightarrow |\psi\rangle \text{ is genuinely 3-partite entangled.}$$

$$\mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle) > 4 \Longrightarrow |\psi\rangle \text{ is genuinely 4-partite entangled.}$$

Our last condition for multipartite entanglement is given by the following proposition.

Proposition 6 *For any n-qubit pure state $|\psi\rangle$, $n \geq 5$, and for any $m \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor - 1$ the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle) > \binom{m}{2} + \binom{n-m}{2} + \delta_{m,2} \\ &\Longrightarrow |\psi\rangle \text{ is genuinely } m\text{−partite entangled.} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any n-partite state consider all possible bipartite divisions (i_1, i_2), where $i_1 \leq i_2$ and $i_1 + i_2 = n$. Note that the $\mathcal{N}$ values corresponding to different divisions are in the following order:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}\left(|\psi^1\rangle|\psi^{n-1}\rangle\right) > \mathcal{N}\left(|\psi^2\rangle|\psi^{n-2}\rangle\right) > ... \\ > \mathcal{N}\left(|\psi^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}\rangle|\psi^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}\rangle\right). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Indeed, for any $i_1 \in \left[1, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor - 1\right]$ and $n \geq 5$ (such that division $(2, 2)$ is excluded) the difference of adjacent divisions is strictly positive:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{N}\left(|\psi^{i_1}\rangle|\psi^{n-i_1}\rangle\right) - \mathcal{N}\left(|\psi^{i_1+1}\rangle|\psi^{n-i_1-1}\rangle\right) \\ &= \binom{i_1}{2} + \delta_{i_1,2} + \binom{n-i_1}{2} + \delta_{n-i_1,2} \\ &- \binom{i_1+1}{2} - \delta_{i_1+1,2} - \binom{n-i_1-1}{2} - \delta_{n-i_1-1,2} \\ &\geq n - 2i_1 - 2 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{N}(|\psi\rangle) > \mathcal{N}\left(|\psi^m\rangle|\psi^{n-m}\rangle\right)$ then, due to the ordering of divisions, the state ψ contains entanglement between at least $m + 1$ parties.□

V. APPLICATIONS TO DETECTION OF A MULTIPARTITE ENTANGLEMENT OF DICKE STATES

For a direct application of these new conditions let us consider the family of n-partite Dicke states with e excitations:

$$D_n^e = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\binom{n}{e}}} \sum_{\pi} |\pi(\underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{e}, \underbrace{0, ..., 0}_{n-e})\rangle, \tag{15}$$

where summation is performed over all permutations. It can be shown that for odd n

$$\mathcal{N}(D_n^e) = \frac{4e^2(n-e)^2}{n(n-1)}. \tag{16}$$

This expression is maximized for states of type $D_n^{(n-1)/2}$ for which

$$\mathcal{N}(D_n^{(n-1)/2}) = \frac{(n+1)^2(n-1)}{4n}. \tag{17}$$

Using our conditions for entanglement we can prove the following properties of this family. States D_3^1 and D_5^2 are genuinely multipartite entangled which follows from Proposition 5. States $D_n^{(n-1)/2}$ where n is odd number, are genuinely $\left(\frac{n+3}{2}\right)$–partite entangled which is a consequence of Proposition 6.

VI. DISCUSSION

The fact that the multipartite entanglement of Dicke states can be detected with lower order correlations is not surprising, since it is known that these states are uniquely determined by their reduced density matrices [10]. Namely, a Dicke state with e excitations is the only state compatible with its $2e$-partite reduced density operators [10]. Therefore, with increase in e there is higher and higher dependence on multipartite correlations. However, entanglement is just one of many defining features of a quantum state and for this reason knowledge of the full state is not necessary to say something about its entanglement. It is still intriguing that the conditions we derive, although solely based on bipartite correlations detect better Dicke states with higher excitation number.

Another family of conditions based on bipartite correlations are those in terms of spin operators [11]. The main difference with respect to our conditions is that the ones of Ref. [11] are linear in correlations whereas ours are quadratic. The quadratic conditions have the following advantage: once the bound for entanglement is achieved we can stop measuring the system as any future measurement can only make the sum of squared correlations bigger. In contradistinction, for the linear conditions all correlations have to be measured as it is possible that correlations measured in next experimental run will be negative.

Finally, we note that the Dicke states are manifestly n-party entangled and the fact that our criterion does not detect it may be regarded as a drawback. A question appears if bi-partite correlations can be used to detect this multipartite entanglement at all. The answer is positive as soon as we use the fact that the Dicke states are permutationally invariant. Note that for a biproduct state there must be two subsystems with correlations satisfying $T_{xz}T_{zx} = T_{xx}T_{zz}$ as every correlation function that enters here is just a product of local averages. Therefore, if Dicke state were a biproduct state some of its bipartite correlations would have to satisfy this relation. It is easy to check that this is not the case for any finite n. We would therefore like to stress that the conditions derived here do not make any assumptions about studied states and the Dicke states should be treated just as a simple example of their applications.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have derived experimentally friendly conditions for multipartite entanglement using the principle of correlation complementarity. These conditions are solely based on bipartite correlations. We compared them to other known conditions and provided examples of their application.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TP acknowledges discussions with Minh Cong Tran. This work is supported by the EU program Q-ESSENCE (Contract No.248095) and the MNiSW Grant no. N202 208538. The contribution of MM is supported within the International PhD Project "Physics of future quantum-based information technologies" grant MPD/2009-3/4 from Foundation for Polish Science. WL and MŻ are supported by the Foundation for Polish Science TEAM project cofinanced by the EU European Regional Development Fund. TP is supported by the National Research Foundation and Ministry of Education in Singapore.

Appendix A: Technical lemma

Lemma 1 *For any $n \geq 3$ and for any $k \in [2, n]$ the following conditions hold:*

$$\forall \{i_m\}_{m=1}^{k} \left(i_m \geq 1 \wedge \sum_{m=1}^{k} i_m = n \right)$$
$$\Longrightarrow \sum_{m=1}^{k} \binom{i_m}{2} \leq \binom{n-k+1}{2} \tag{A1}$$
$$\forall \{i_m\}_{m=1}^{k} \left(i_m \geq 0 \wedge \sum_{m=1}^{k} i_m = n \right)$$
$$\Longrightarrow \sum_{m=1}^{k} \binom{i_m}{2} \leq \binom{n}{2} \tag{A2}$$

Note that the sum in the second part of implications can be expressed as:

$$\sum_{m=1}^{k} \binom{i_m}{2} = \sum_{m=1}^{k} \frac{i_m(i_m-1)}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{k} i_m^2 - n \right)$$

Let us first consider case (A1), when all $i_m \geq 1$. The sum $\sum_{m=1}^{k} i_m^2$ is maximized, when all but one of the terms of the sequence $\{i_m\}_{m=1}^{k}$ equals to 1, and one of them equals $n-k+1$. This can be easily proven using Lagrange method of finding conditional extrema.

In the case (A2), when $0 \leq i_m \leq n$, in complete analogy with (A1), we can prove that with given boundary conditions, the sum is maximized when all but one terms are 0, and one equals $\binom{n}{2}$. $\square$

[1] D. Kaszlikowski, A. Sen(De), U. Sen, V. Vedral, and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 070502 (2008).

[2] C. H. Bennett, A. Grudka, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 012312 (2011).

[3] P. Kurzyński, T. Paterek, R. Ramanathan, W. Laskowski, and D. Kaszlikowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 180402 (2011).

[4] L.E. Würflinger, J-D. Bancal, A. Acín, N. Gisin and T. Vertesi, arXiv:1203.4968v1 [quant-ph](2012).

[5] W. Laskowski, D. Richart, C. Schwemmer, T. Paterek, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 240501 (2012)

[6] A. Klyachko, arXiv:0409113v1 [quant-ph] (2004).

[7] V. Scarani and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 117901 (2001); Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012311 (2001).

[8] R. Ramanathan, T. Paterek, A. Kay, P. Kurzyński, and D. Kaszlikowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 060405 (2011).

[9] F. Verstraete, V. Murg and J.I. Cirac, Adv. Phys. **57**, 143-224 (2008).

[10] P. Parashar and S. Rana, J. Phys. A: Math. Teor. **42** (2009) 462003.

[11] G. Tóth, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **24**, 275 (2007).